

Posted by: John Campbell at 11:09 AM Just in case you thought the conservatives on Capitol Hill were the only ones up in arms over the pork filled appropriations bill meant to fund the war, in an editorial this morning, the Washington Post criticized the bill because of the reckless withdraw p... Posted by: John Campbell at 11:09 AM

Just in case you thought the conservatives on Capitol Hill were the only ones up in arms over the pork filled appropriations bill meant to fund the war, in an editorial this morning, the *Washington Post* criticized the bill because of the reckless withdraw provisions and the \$20 billion in unrelated spending thrown in the bill.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/03/22/AR2007032201883.html>

The legislation pays more heed to a handful of peanut farmers than to the 24 million Iraqis who are living through a maelstrom initiated by the United States, the outcome of which could shape the future of the Middle East for decades.

As it is, House Democrats are pressing a bill that has the endorsement of MoveOn.org but excludes the judgment of the U.S. commanders who would have to execute the retreat the bill mandates. It would heap money on unneedy dairy farmers while provoking a constitutional fight with the White House that could block the funding to equip troops in the field. Democrats who want to force a withdrawal should vote against war appropriations. They should not seek to use pork to buy a majority for an unconditional retreat that the majority does not support.

In addition, to the the article in the *Washington Post*, I was particularly struck by a [report](#) released by the

[RSC](#)

. Among other things, it found that if you took the \$219 million allotted in the bill for spinach, peanut storage, and shrimp fishing, and directed it to the troops, it would be the equivalent of providing every soldier in Iraq with an additional \$1,425.